



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

A SOCIOLOGICAL CRITICISM OF WAR AND MILITARISM: AN ANALYSIS OF THE DOCTRINES OF JACQUES NOVICOW

*By Harry Elmer Barnes, Professor of History,
Clark University*

I. GENERAL NATURE OF HIS SOCIOLOGICAL SYSTEM, AND
A DESCRIPTIVE LIST OF HIS CHIEF WRITINGS

As was pointed out in the writer's preceding article on Gumpłowicz, the chief immediate influence of Darwinism upon sociology, aside from stimulating research into the early history of mankind, consisted in leading many writers to attempt to construct systems of sociology on the foundation of the Darwinian formula carried over into the realm of social phenomena without a proper modification. There thus arose a pseudo-Darwinian sociology bristling with misleading dogmas, though in some instances emphasizing some important social processes which had hitherto been neglected. Among the sociologists of this type Gumpłowicz and his followers were the most conspicuous, and with them were allied certain statesmen and political scientists who employed the pseudo-Darwinism as a cloak for their militaristic axe. While some biological writers, particularly Wallace, Huxley, and Pearson, had pointed out the fallacies involved in a direct transference of the Darwinian biological terminology into the field of sociological investigation, the Russian writer Jacques Novicow (1849-1912) was the first avowed sociologist to devote his life and system of sociology to a refutation of the doctrine that an unmitigated physical struggle for existence is the chief factor in the social process and the mainspring of human progress.

The experiences of Novicow's own life doubtless did much to determine the nature of his sociological and political theories. His own cosmopolitanism must have had an

important influence upon his fundamental doctrines regarding the value of a federation of nations and the necessity of the cultural assimilation of peoples before attempting to make them a part of any political group. Coming to France as a young man, Novicow used the French language as a medium of expression, and many of his ideas reflect the influence of the western European environment. This is particularly apparent in his anti-militaristic doctrines and his frequent attacks upon Bismarck and the policy of "blood and iron" which the latter represented. The Franco-Prussian War and the seizure of Alsace-Lorraine are constantly utilized to illustrate the folly, perfidy, and injustice of militaristic statesmanship. At the same time, his earlier life in Russia left its imprint in making him an implacable enemy of despotism and of all interference with the free and spontaneous development of the human mind and the unhampered spread of ideas. Like Thomas Jefferson, he had apparently sworn "eternal enmity to every form of tyranny over the mind of man." His Russian environment also served to stimulate his emphasis on coöperation and mutual aid as socializing factors.

Novicow's first important work was entitled *La Politique internationale*.¹ According to the opinion of Eugene Véron, who furnished the introduction to the work, it was the first coherent and comprehensive exposition of a theory of international political organization. Probably this is rather an extreme statement for, as Mr. Darby and others have shown, from the days of Dante an occasional isolated writer has from time to time expressed a more or less vague idea of a union of nations, but there can be little doubt that Novicow's work was one of the first scientific modern treatments of the subject.² The first portion of the work is devoted to an analysis of the organic theory of society and to a discussion of the nature and mutual relations of the state and the nation. The second part is a prelude to his major work *Les Luites entre sociétés humaines*, and states

¹ Published in Paris in 1886.

² For a brief analysis of the earlier plans for international organization in Europe see S. P. Duggan, *The League of Nations*, Chapter ii.

his fundamental contribution to sociology, namely, that while the struggle for existence is the all-important process in social evolution, this struggle becomes in society primarily an intellectual rather than a physical type of conflict. The concluding portion, which deals specifically with the problems of international political organization, is based upon this theory of intellectual conflict, since the chief advantage of international federation is that it will make it possible for states to carry on an intellectual struggle, which is beneficial, in the place of the highly detrimental physical conflicts that occur in the form of wars. This work contains the suggestions and theses which were elaborated in *Les Lutttes* and afterwards further developed in a number of separate volumes.

Novicow's chief work, and the one which embodies all of his vital conceptions, is entitled *Les Lutttes entre sociétés humaines et leurs phases successives*.³

Novicow's basic thesis is that the course of human evolution has been characterized by struggles and alliances which, in a serial succession, have been primarily physiological, economic, political, and intellectual. While all of these types of strife must necessarily persist, they constitute a progressive series in which the intellectual struggles are the highest type and are becoming increasingly predominant. In fact, even the lower types of strife are tending to come more and more under rational direction.⁴ Novicow devotes his first book of *Les Lutttes* to a brief survey of the fundamental propositions, the expansion and elaboration of which constitute his sociological system. At its close he summarizes them conveniently as follows:

³ First published in 1893. Citations in the present article are from the second revised edition of 1896. His later works are primarily an expansion of some of the theses partially elaborated in *Les Lutttes*. If this work and its successor, *La Guerre et ses prétendus bienfaits* (1894), had been familiar to English readers, Mr. Norman Angell's *The Great Illusion* would have attracted far less attention, as it contained few ideas that had not been developed with great vigor by Novicow a decade and a half before. So far as is known to the writer, the best short summary of this major work of Novicow in English is to be found in L. M. Bristol, *Social Adaptation*, pp. 268-282.

⁴ *Les Lutttes*, Book I, *passim*, Book III, chap. viii.

The universe is an arena of endless combats and alliances. It is impossible to fix any limit to the possible extent of association.

The struggle for existence is a universal phenomenon. It is in turn and successively chemical, astronomical, biological, and social.

Between plants and animals the struggle takes two principal phases: elimination and absorption.

But even among animals we may distinguish economic and mental struggles.

Alliance does not necessarily exclude the possibility of struggle within groups, but it modifies the nature of the struggle.

The result of the struggle for existence is adaptation to the environment.

From the psychological point of view, adaptation to the environment furnishes the most exact formula for comprehending the nature of the universe.

The struggle for existence, in eliminating those least adapted to the cosmic environment, brings about an increasingly perfect harmony between the subject and the object.

Pleasure consists in a harmony between the external and the internal world.

Finally, progress is simply an acceleration of the process of adaptation.⁵

With these general propositions in mind, Novicow's analysis of the chief historic types of human conflict may be examined in greater detail.⁶ Each of the four phases of human struggles—physiological, economic, political, and intellectual—appears under two different manifestations—a slow and irrational type, and the more advanced rapid and rational variety.⁷

The *physiological* struggle has two main modes—elimination and absorption. The processes of the former need not be discussed. The latter is manifested in a slow and irrational manner by the killing of one's own kind for food, as in cannibalism, and in a rapid and rational manner by killing inferior beings for food and by producing food in an artificial manner. In either case the purpose of the physiological struggle is to obtain nourishment.

⁵ Ibid., p. 50.

⁶ Novicow's detailed exposition of this fundamental aspect of his system is to be found in pp. 51-402 of *Les Luittes*, and is summarized in chapter viii of Book III of that work.

⁷ Ibid., table opposite page 403, a translation of this table is reproduced in Bristol, *Social Adaptation*, p. 278.

The *economic* struggle, and the more elementary and temporary aspects of the political struggle, shade into one another. Their purpose is to secure riches, and the slow and irrational type of the struggles of this variety takes place by killing or threatening to kill others to secure: (1) the means of subsistence through raids in search of food; (2) private movable goods through raids appropriating personal property and slaves; (3) private immovable goods through the confiscation of lands and dwellings and the reduction of the conquered inhabitants to a condition of bondage and servitude; (4) public movable property through a war tax; (5) public immovable wealth by means of a permanent tribute. The rapid and rational manifestation of the economic struggle and of the elementary and temporary political struggle takes the form of: (1) more rapid production for a better market than is the case with competitors; (2) good government, resulting in an increase of the revenues of a country.

The higher and permanent *political* struggle has for its object the securing of riches and the satisfaction of national or group vanity. It manifests itself in a slow and irrational manner through killing or threatening to kill or punish others in order to obtain by conquest a revenue for the conqueror, or superior political rights and privileges for the conquering group. The rapid and rational method of carrying on the higher type of the political struggle is through leading foreign states to desire annexation, thereby building up political federations, and by carrying on a propaganda to spread by persuasion the political conceptions and ideals among the various neighboring nations.

The *intellectual* struggle has for its purpose the securing of mental satisfactions of various sorts. Its slow and irrational manifestation is through killing, threatening to kill or punish, or through granting favors to others for the purpose of imposing a set of ideas upon a people by religious wars or persecutions, or for the purpose of forcing a given type of civilization upon another people by coercive denationalization. Finally, the rapid and rational type of intellectual struggle is seen in promoting the free assimilation of

ideas and in stimulating the imitation of the culture, the spread of which is desired.

Novicow formulates certain fundamental deductions and generalizations regarding these four main types of struggles with their various manifestations. He holds that these human struggles in society are but a continuance of the earlier chemical, astronomical, and biological conflict.⁸ These four types of conflict form a logical sequence, and progress consists in increasing the scope and influence of the higher forms and in substituting within each general type of conflict the rational and rapid manifestation for the slow and irrational expression.⁹ This progressive transformation is to a certain extent brought about automatically by the operation of the universal biological law that all living beings tend to avoid pain and seek pleasure.¹⁰ The lower and more elementary types of conflict are obstructive to progress if introduced into the field of the higher phases of conflict. This explains the folly of an attempt on the part of the state to interfere with the various manifestations of intellectual conflict.¹¹ The further developments of civilization in the future will not bring about a cessation of conflict, but will rather tend to produce a greater amount of strife within society. The conflict, however, will become increasingly intellectual in character, and the growth in its volume will thus be beneficial, as social evolution is most rapid in those societies which provide the widest scope for intellectual conflict.¹² Not only will conflict in the future increase in volume and tend to become predominantly intellectual, but it will be accompanied by an increase of justice and sympathy and a decrease of hatred. It will tend towards competition, tempered by mutual esteem and tolerance.¹³ This series of struggles tends to bring about the

⁸ *Les Luites*, pp. 417ff.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 404.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 407. This is, of course, a proposition drawn from the partially discredited hedonistic psychology of Epicurus, Machiavelli, Hobbes, Helvetius, Bentham and the utilitarians, and Professors Patten and Ward.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 330-335, 416ff.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 424ff, 444-445, 447ff., 452.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 455ff.

survival of the best individuals, and this survival of the best may be regarded as the essence of justice in its broadest signification. Justice is thus the real goal of the cosmic and social processes, which find their final and most perfect expression in the intellectual struggles of humanity.¹⁴

The subject of the waste and disorder in modern society, particularly as due to the expenditures in wars and militaristic measures and the bungling interference of the government in economic matters, is discussed by Novicow in his work entitled *Les Gaspillages des sociétés modernes*.¹⁵ The indictment of war and its advocates is carried still further in his *La Guerre et ses prétendus bienfaits*.¹⁶ It examines briefly the physiological, economic, political, intellectual, and moral effects of war. In the concluding portion he develops the thesis that social Darwinism is a product of a theoretical misunderstanding and of a misapplication of Darwinian biological theories to an interpretation of social processes, plus the prestige of militaristic ideas represented by Bismarck and his disciples. He pays his respects to Gumpłowicz and Ratzenhofer, the two most conspicuous exponents of this type of sociological theories. Novicow could not, of course, avail himself of the powerful biological defense of his position recently set forth by Nicolai in his *Biology of War*.¹⁷

¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 481ff., 485-486, 498. Novicow makes the analysis of justice from this standpoint the subject of a detailed exposition in his work entitled *La Justice et l'expansion de la vie*, Paris, 1905. This work is briefly summarized by Hecker, *Russian Sociology*, pp. 277-284.

¹⁵ Paris, 1894.

¹⁶ Paris, 1894, an English translation of this work by Thomas Seltzer appeared in 1911. The work is reviewed by E. V. D. Robinson, *American Journal of Sociology*, November, 1898, pp. 408-410.

¹⁷ In 1897 Novicow published his *Conscience et volonté sociales*, which ranks next to *Les Luites* among his contributions to sociological theory. (Reviewed by G. E. Vincent, *American Journal of Sociology*, January, 1898, pp. 544-545.) This is devoted to an elaboration of his psychological interpretation of society, which is in turn based upon a modified version of the organic theory of society. His chief thesis is that the *élite* in society, and not the government, are the social sensorium—the brain of the social organism. He attempts to compute the numerical proportion of the *élite* in modern society and to estimate their importance in social progress. Like LeBon, he finds the English aristocracy to be particularly worthy of

The possibility of a federation of European states and the advantages which would accrue from such a movement—a proposal to be found in all of Novicow's works—is treated in a specific and extended manner in *La Fédération de l'Europe*.¹⁸ The first part of the work is devoted to the economic, political, and general advantages of a federation of European states. In the second portion he finds that the chief obstacles to international federation are: greed for territorial expansion, the prestige of war, the errors of militaristic leaders and theorists, the jealousy of vested militaristic interests, chauvinism and the desire for national expansion, the defiance of the rules of international justice, race hatred, egotistical patriotism or national myopia, the illusions of nationality, the conservative effects and inertia of routine and tradition, and, finally, the lack of constructive imagination. In the third part of the work he discusses the factors which favor federation, such as economic technique and organization, the extension of mental horizon, ethical and political forces, military technique and organization, general European patriotism, and the growing spirit of cosmopolitanism and universalism. In the concluding sections he analyzes the methods by which the federation is to be achieved, the progress which has already been made in this direction, and the probable character of future international federal institutions.

Novicow's most direct and telling attack upon pseudo-Darwinian sociology is embodied in his *La Critique du dar-*

the admiration of the sociologist. The latter part of the work is essentially a psychological analysis of present European social problems, particularly militarism and socialism, both of which naturally fail to secure from him any enthusiastic support. Novicow's elaboration of the organic theory of society, which is briefly referred to in his *Politique internationale* and his *Conscience et volonté sociales*, is to be found in his contribution to the symposium on the organic theory of society published in the *Annales de l'institut international de sociologie*, Vol. IV, 1898, and in his work, *Théorie organique des sociétés*. (Paris, 1899.) In general, Novicow's organic theory of society is based upon the proposition that the identity between society and the organism consists chiefly in the fact that both are living entities comprehending a unified and organized system of vital processes. It is among the more acceptable of the classic expositions of the organic theory.

¹⁸ Paris, 1901.

winisme social.¹⁹ This work is devoted to a relentless criticism of the exponents of the theory that group struggle on a physical basis is the chief motive power in social progress. Spencer and Renan are criticized to a certain extent, but Ward and Ratzenhofer receive the brunt of the attack. Gumpłowicz, the most flagrant of the offenders in this respect, is for some reason passed over with almost no reference. Aside from a large amount of criticism of individual systems of sociology, the earlier part of the work is devoted to an analysis of the errors of the sociologists in interpreting biological processes, and of the logical confusion involved in the direct application of biological formulae to social processes. The latter portion of the work considers the erroneous doctrines which are a result of the elaboration of these systems of pseudo-Darwinian sociology. While Novicow's criticism is as one-sided as the theories of his opponents, and neither school shows an assiduous application to the study of the latest researches in biology, anthropology and ethnology, no one should attempt to defend the doctrines of the Gumpłowicz-Ratzenhofer-Oppenheimer-Ward group without first having considered the objections so skillfully marshaled by Novicow. Particularly satisfactory is Novicow's attack upon what he designates, with a considerable degree of accuracy, "anthropological romances," namely, the doctrines that primitive groups are inherently hostile to one another, that social evolution is the automatic result of physical conflict in society, that industry originated wholly in slavery, and that the state took its origin and development exclusively from the wars of primitive tribal groups.

Novicow's last comprehensive work, *Mécanisme et limites de l'association humaine*,²⁰ a fitting conclusion and summary of his literary activity, is an elaboration of his oft-repeated doctrine that there is no logical or practical limit to the possible extent of human association. He shows that

¹⁹ Paris, 1910.

²⁰ Paris, 1912. An English translation by S. P. Otis and edited by Professor Ellwood appeared in the *American Journal of Sociology*, November, 1917. The sub-title is "The Foundation of a Society of Peace."

western society is becoming in every aspect, except that of legal relations, a single unified human association, and carries further his demonstration of the erroneous nature of the objections offered to the feasibility of international federation. International relations and social progress in all fields depend upon a proper understanding of the mechanism of association. Exchange is the source of all life, while spoliation is the fundamental phenomenon of death. Exchange is the real foundation and source of human association. It may be divided under the headings of exchange of commodities for commodities, of commodities for services, and of services for services. Ultimately, all exchange is based on the increase of personal enjoyments. Not only association, but also the division of labor and civilization itself are based on exchange. In modern civilization, with its improved mechanism for transportation and communication, no valid limits can be set to the possible range of exchange. Therefore, one cannot set limits to the development of human association. Exchange not only brings about association and social organization; it also produces the state and justice. The state is essential to the settling of property problems connected with exchange, to the enforcing of rules of exchange, and to the development of the mechanism and technology of transportation and communication. In fact, exchange is far more significant in producing the state than war and conquest, which are so unduly emphasized by Gumplowicz and his followers. Exchange not only creates the state, but is also preparing the way for the federation of states. Most international agreements already made relate in some way to exchange, as, for example, international adjustments relative to waterways, telegraphs, postoffices, reciprocity, and the like. Contrary to a general impression, commerce is far more a cause of human solidarity than of social and national conflicts. The true and logical boundaries are those social boundaries based on exchange or vital circulation. Political boundaries are those which impose limits on lawful spoliation. If it were properly understood that spoliation is not a cause of gain, but is ultimately a cause of the destruction of the despoiler,

as well as his victim—in short, a pathological illusion—then the political boundaries would tend to approximate the basic social boundaries. But it has already been shown that social boundaries, based on exchange, are international if not illusory. Therefore, the disappearance of the “spoliation illusion” will naturally be followed by international federation and the extinction of the class struggle within human society. International anarchy and social oppression require for their elimination only a proper education of the world as to the dangerous fallacy involved in the doctrine of spoliation, and Novicow’s own work constitutes the dedication of a lifetime of literary activity to that laudable end.

II. SPECIFIC SOCIOLOGICAL AND POLITICAL DOCTRINES

1. *The nature and scope of sociology*

According to Novicow, sociology is the general and all-inclusive science of society of which the special social sciences are subordinate branches. It is based upon the laws of biology and psychology, and has for its main subdivisions economics, political science, and jurisprudence.²¹ Sociology is still in the metaphysical stage of *à priori* dogmatism. It cannot reach a state of high development until it has been based upon the concrete, exact and inductive methods of the natural sciences.²² When it has arrived at the status of a true science of society it will be the indispensable guide for the conduct of political activities. “Alors il paraîtra aussi monstrueux de vouloir faire une loi sans se baser sur les enseignements de la sociologie, qu’il paraît monstrueux aujourd’hui, de vouloir faire une machine sans se baser sur les enseignements de la mécanique.”²³

2. *Fundamental definitions and concepts*

Novicow’s differentiation between the concepts society, state, and nation is clear and accurate. He admits that it

²¹ Novicow, *Les Luites entre sociétés humaines*, pp. 531, 636.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 636.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 708.

is hard to determine just where society begins in the world of phenomena, even though it is not difficult to decide upon the attributes of a society. The mere contact or contiguity of a number of objects does not constitute a society; in addition to contiguity there must be reciprocal action and relations between the different units. But this reciprocal action begins among the chemical elements in the inorganic world and passes by degrees of intensity up through the cells of organic matter and the mutual relations of individual animals and men to the division of labor between groups of men. In fact, it is as difficult to determine where a society ends as it is to discover just where it begins.²⁴ From a morphological point of view a society may be defined as "un ensemble d'êtres vivants dont chacun, en particulier, est perceptible à notre regard et qui est séparé des autres membres du groupe par des espaces également appréciables pour nous."²⁵ From the functional standpoint "société signifie réunion de certaines unités entre lesquelles s'établit une circulation vitale."²⁶ From the psychological point of view, a group may be said to be transformed into a society "à partir du moment où des êtres peuvent avoir des représentations internes de la solidarité qui les unit à leurs semblables."²⁷ The close resemblance of this last definition to Professor Giddings' conception of the "consciousness of kind" as the distinguishing mark of a society is readily apparent. The state is a special type of society—one which possesses an organization designed to defend its citizens and its material possessions.²⁸ The nation differs from the state primarily in that it is founded mainly upon psychic traits and cultural possessions rather than upon material wealth and interests.²⁹ The nation is thus a higher product of social

²⁴ Ibid., pp. 7-10.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 8.

²⁶ *La Critique du darwinisme social*, p. 124.

²⁷ *Les Luites*, p. 8.

²⁸ "L'État pourrait être défini: une société possédant un ensemble de richesses matérielles ainsi que l'organisation et l'outillage nécessaires pour les défendre." Ibid., p. 239.

²⁹ "Une nationalité pourrait être définie: une société possédant, outre les richesses matérielles, un ensemble de richesses mentales. . . . Comme dans l'évolution psychologique on va de la sensation à l'idée,

evolution than the state and need not be identical in extent with the state. While there has been a tendency in European history to attempt to make the state identical with the nation, there are many instances in the past and at the present of one nationality distributed among a number of states and of one state comprehending several different nationalities.³⁰

As no other sociologist has given more careful attention to the problem of nationality than Novicow, it might be well to examine more in detail his conception of the attributes of nationality. He examines in turn the various criteria which have been proposed as tests of nationality, including territorial unity, racial homogeneity, a common language, a similar religious system, like legal institutions, resemblance of manners and customs, and identity of historic destiny.³¹ He concludes that neither any one of these criteria nor all taken together can be regarded as constituting the essence of nationality. They are all important elements of nationality, and a common language is an indispensable prerequisite for national development, but to them must be added the element of sympathy or psychic affinity and solidarity.³² Nationality is not a sudden acquisition. Rather it is the product of a long period of evolution through which a group passes from the bonds of a

de l'idée au sentiment et du sentiment à la volonté, dans l'évolution sociale on va de la communauté des intérêts matériels (État) à la communauté des idées, des sentiments et des volontés (nationalité). Ibid., pp. 239, 251.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 253f. Cf. *La Politique internationale*, pp. 90ff.

³¹ Ibid., pp. 129ff., 239ff.

³² "Ainsi le territoire, la race, la langue, la religion, le droit, les usages, et les mœurs, la destinée historique ne constituent ni séparément, ni même pris ensemble l'essence de la nationalité. Sans doute, chacun de ces éléments entre dans une mesure quelconque, comme facteur de l'unité nationale, mais il y a un principe supérieur qui les englobe et les domine tous, c'est l'intérêt, d'abord matériel, puis mental, des unités composantes. . . . Ce sont donc, l'affinité psychique et la sympathie qui sont les traits les plus distinctifs de la nationalité. . . . Cela veut dire simplement qu'à tous les éléments de la nationalité s'ajoute la sympathie. Elle couronne l'édifice, elle lui donne de ciment inébranlable sans lequel il ne peut pas subsister. Or qui dit sympathie, dit volonté d'être associé et de vivre ensemble." *Les Luites*, pp. 246-249. Cf. *Conscience et volonté sociales*, p. 331.

constraining political solidarity through the attachment of mutual material interests to a psychic solidarity.³³ This very fact that a nation is the product of a long developmental period and is based upon common psychic traits that can be produced only through a long continued period of assimilation and interaction demonstrates the folly of attempting to reduce different peoples to a common nationality in a short period of time by compulsory and often brutally repressive measures.³⁴ Not only is the nation a higher product of social evolution than the state, but it is also a more important agency in social progress. The state is at best a clumsy and expensive collective policeman, progress and initiative have their roots in the nation.³⁵ The important distinction between the state and the government is not clearly defined nor consistently maintained by Novicow.

As to the attributes of the state, at least of the state as it exists at present, Novicow is in accord with the general consensus of opinion among the best writers on political science. He holds that the four fundamental attributes are territory, population, sovereign power, and governmental organization.³⁶ While Novicow admits that absolute sovereign power within its boundaries is at present regarded as an indispensable mark of the state, he believes that such a power is more metaphysical than real and is, moreover, most detrimental in its implications and results. The conventional view of absolute sovereignty is the chief obstacle to the consummation of European federation. He

³³ "La nationalité est la couronnement d'une longue évolution, comme la fleur est le produit du développement de la plante." *Les Luites*, p. 248.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 125ff, 251ff.

³⁵ "La puissance créatrice réside dans les nations et non dans les gouvernements. C'est de la nation que sont toujours sortis tous les progrès et toutes les initiatives. Les gouvernements ne font que suivre de loin et *pedo claudo* l'impulsion qui leur vient de la nation." *Ibid.*, p. 345. The various aspects of the relations of state and nationality, according to Novicow, will be considered more in detail below in dealing with the proper scope of state action in regard to affairs of national and international import.

³⁶ "Un État est donc, par la force de choses, une certaine région du globe plus ou moins bien délimitée, composée d'un maître (individuel ou collectif, peu importe) et de sujets." *Ibid.*, p. 238.

would allow the state nothing but administrative authority and would confer sovereign authority upon the future federation of states.³⁷

Much more important, of course, for political theory in its newer interpretation is Novicow's discussion of the psychological and economic factors in the state, but as these subjects are dealt with in other sections of the paper they may be passed over here. Particularly important are his emphasis on the significance of intellectual competition as the chief dynamic force in cultural progress, his contention that the intellectual aristocracy and not the state are the real brain of the social organism, and his doctrine that economic phenomena and factors, especially those of exchange, were the chief cause of the origin and development of the state and the most potent force which is determining its present characteristics and its future changes.

3. *The origin of political institutions*

In regard to the problem of the origin of the state and government, Novicow's opinions show a considerable variation as between his earliest and most recent views. This change in attitude can best be understood by examining his opinion on this subject as expressed in *Les Lutttes* and the modification of this theory as found in his latest view of the subject in *La Critique du darwinisme social* and *Mécanisme et limites de l'association humaine*.

The account, as presented in *Les Lutttes*, may be briefly summarized in the following manner. Man originally lived as a nomad, and the primitive social groups were held together by bonds of real kinship. In other words, the first social bond was physiological. These primitive groups of nomadic kinsmen multiplied and subdivided with each

³⁷ Ibid., pp. 534-535, 576, 616; *La Politique internationale*, p. 97; *La Critique du darwinisme social*, pp. 117, 296. This constant mingling of analysis and prophecy in Novicow's work makes it somewhat difficult to determine exactly his views on many theoretical conditions. In addition to this, his opinions on many subjects immediately connected with questions of war and nationality have undergone a progressive evolution, so that they are in many cases considerably different in his earlier works from what they have become in his more recent writings.

new generation, and the new groups united with the original bands in larger kinship groups, such as gentes and tribes.³⁸ The next type of social grouping—the territorial state—grew up as a result of conflict between these primordial kinship groups. These bands of kinsmen were wont to carry on pillaging expeditions against their neighbors, and the successful execution of such enterprises called for an effective organization for concerted activity. On the other hand, as each group was exposed to reciprocal attacks from other pillaging bands, it was compelled to develop an organization for collective defense. Out of this two-fold organization for collective activity, offensive and defensive, there grew by degrees the political entity known as the territorial state.³⁹ Property played an important part in the origin of the state. After a chief had conquered a neighboring group and levied a tribute he was compelled to protect this tribute-paying group, not from humanitarian reasons, but to preserve his source of revenue from being appropriated by some rival chieftain. As land was the main type of property in primitive times the most important booty of these early pillaging groups was the territory of the conquered groups which was distributed among the followers of the successful chieftain. Of course, history affords instances of pillaging groups, like the German *comitatus*, which were not based upon kinship, but rather were created by voluntary agreement. Such cases, however, were the exception rather than the rule.⁴⁰ Though the state may have had a two-fold origin in organization for both attack and defense, the latter purpose has been by far the most important element in its survival. The state has persisted as a social institution, after a long period of evolution, because it has proved its ability to confer advantages upon its citizens, particularly in regard to the security of life and property.⁴¹ Along with this establishment of political institutions on a firm territorial basis there went

³⁸ Op cit., p. 82.

³⁹ Ibid., pp. 83f., 246.

⁴⁰ Ibid., pp. 83ff., 223, 246, 362.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 246.

a wide-spread transformation of social institutions in general. Agriculture was improved. Commerce, the appearance of money and capital, the division of labor and other important progressive steps in social functioning began their development. The growing security aided in the production of wealth, and legal relations had to be perfected in order to regulate these increasingly complex industrial and commercial relations.⁴²

The first type of territorial state was the small city-state, so characteristic of antiquity and the middle ages. It was normally small enough so that all the citizens could participate personally in the political life.⁴³ The process of war continued between these city-states. The best organized tended to grow at the expense of those that were loosely or ineffectively organized. In this manner there arose the empires of antiquity and the national monarchies of early modern times.⁴⁴ Homogeneity has always been a very important factor in the organization of the state, and, consequently, in its expansion. Other things being equal, the more homogeneous a state the more effective its organization and the more rapid and permanent its expansion.⁴⁵ If the expanding state did not take steps to assimilate its additions and keep homogeneity moving apace with aggrandizement, it continually faced the danger of disruption, and many of the ancient empires perished from this very cause.⁴⁶ This homogeneity, taken in all its manifold aspects, including the sentiment of solidarity, constitutes the principle of nationality.⁴⁷ From this cause there has been a natural tendency in political expansion to attempt to make the state identical with the nation and forcibly to assimilate conquered peoples.⁴⁸ But at present this principle of forcible assimilation is no longer justifiable, whatever may have been its value at more remote periods, and the only rational

⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 73ff., 206ff., 461ff.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 599.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 261ff., 599ff.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 127, 236, 275, 287.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 127ff., 236ff.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 246, 249.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 127ff.

modern procedure is to let the people decide to what state they desire to attach themselves. Political frontiers should be decided by the will of the peoples concerned. The only commendable type of political expansion at present is an attempt at peaceable assimilation of a neighboring group through leading them to imitate and thus adopt the culture of the more powerful state. Annexation should follow and never precede assimilation, and should only come as a result of a proposal on the part of the annexed population.⁴⁹

The national state of modern times cannot be regarded as the final stage in political evolution or the limit of human association.⁵⁰ Already neighboring nationalities are forming cultural groups held together by intellectual and economic bonds. Western Europe is in fact, if not in law, one common civilization.⁵¹ The next logical step will be to give the existing condition legal recognition by forming a European federation. This will put an end to the wars on that continent, terminate the almost equally disastrous system of armed preparedness, and leave the revenue of the component nations free to be used for intellectual improvement and the increase of material comforts.⁵² This European federation will have for its primary function the maintaining of peace and security among its members.⁵³ It will not interfere with political subdivision and decentralization within each nation. When statesmen and citizens grasp the fundamental truth that the nation and not the state is the important factor in social evolution, and understand that nationality will maintain itself best without political interference, then and then only, will the state tend to become what it should be in modern times—a convenient administrative unit. Nationalities will subdivide themselves into a number of different states in accordance with the principle of adaptability to administrative convenience

⁴⁹ Ibid., pp. 237, 251-261, 290ff.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 575ff. Cf. *Mécanisme et limites de l'association humaine*, passim.

⁵¹ Ibid., pp. 590, 609.

⁵² Ibid., pp. 613ff.

⁵³ Ibid., p. 623.

and efficiency.⁵⁴ The political development of the future, then, will be two-fold: large-scale federation to preserve peace, and administrative subdivision and decentralization to promote governmental efficiency and popular interest in political affairs.⁵⁵

The main subsequent divergence from this early theory of political evolution is to be found in his later treatment of the subject in *La Critique du darwinisme social*, and it appears chiefly in his revised notion of the origin of the state. He almost completely abandons his earlier theory of the origin of the state by denying that war, force, or spoliation had any important influence in this process. He labels the theory of the origin of the state through war and the forcible subjugation of groups, as advanced by Ratzehofer and Ward, "an anthropological romance."⁵⁶ He asks the pertinent question which the group-struggle school has rarely been able to answer without resorting to the grotesque theory of a polygenetic origin of mankind, namely, as to the origin of these contending groups which formed the state through their strife.⁵⁷ In this work Novicow maintains that all available evidence goes to show that the state has normally been the product of the peaceful organization of commerce and industry.⁵⁸ Industry had its origin in coöperation, specialization, and the division of labor rather than in slavery, as Ward contends.⁵⁹ The foundations of the state were laid in tribal society when nomadism had ceased and a group had permanently occupied a tract of land for agricultural pursuits. The bond of kinship was given up in the course of time for a territorial organization, in order to secure greater administrative convenience. The state had a peaceful and economic origin rather than a

⁵⁴ In his *Politique internationale* Novicow was inclined to favor the attempt to make the state identical with the nation, or at least he seems convinced that such is the most desirable arrangement. Cf. pp. 90ff.

⁵⁵ *Les Luites*, pp. 251ff., 268ff., 609ff.

⁵⁶ *Op cit.*, pp. 199ff., 243ff. For Ward's rejoinder see *American Journal of Sociology*, November, 1907, pp. 294-297.

⁵⁷ *La Critique du darwinisme social*, p. 295.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 243ff.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 219-220, 292ff.

warlike derivation. Political organization did not even arise from the attempt to defend a territory, much less from the desire to exploit the lands of another group. It took its origin from the fact that a set of impartial rules were needed to control in an equitable manner the economic processes of coöperation, division of labor, and exchange. The state was, thus, primarily the product of the organization of industry and commerce and the provision of legal rules to protect property and give security to society. It existed in fact long before it had assumed a place in conscious theory. War, far from originating the state, actually delayed its origin in many instances.⁶⁰ Though wars may have had an influence upon the later development of states, the type of political evolution accomplished in this manner is slow, irrational, and pathological compared with the rapid and rational progress achieved as a result of the economic and intellectual motives and impulses.⁶¹ It would unquestionably have been wiser for Novicow to have presented his later theory as another unemphasized aspect of his earlier doctrine, rather than to have denied completely the validity of his first opinion. This course would have had the double advantage of greater consistency and accuracy. Both warlike and peaceful agencies have had an important part to play in political evolution—a fact emphasized by Professors F. H. Giddings, E. C. Hayes and others. Novicow would have done better to have attempted to present both sides of the picture without denying the partial validity of each.

In his latest work, *Mécanisme et limites de l'association humaine*, Novicow gives a summary of his final views on the origin of the state and holds firmly to the economic rather than the military view of political origins:

Another very important conclusion that arises out of the preceding analysis is that the effects of the economic factors of exchange alone are sufficient for the organization of the state. The

⁶⁰ Ibid., pp. 243-250, 292-309. Novicow had reached the same conclusions regarding the primarily peaceful origin of the state in his *La Justice et l'expansion de la vie*, published some five years before. Cf. Hecker, *Russian Sociology*, pp. 281-282.

⁶¹ Hecker, op. cit., p. 281.

theories in vogue at the present day contend that the state can only be formed by coercion. Such theories, however, will not bear the most elementary analysis. A single argument is sufficient to refute them completely; that is, that the chief factors of coercion, such as wars, conquests, etc., usually occur at more or less protracted intervals. Economic factors, on the contrary, are constantly at work. We have had exchanges from the very moment that the simplest division of labor took place among men—and that was hundreds of centuries ago. Moreover, since man cannot live without food, the influence of economic factors in society never wanes for a moment. If economic factors alone, therefore, are sufficient for the formation of the state, and if human life is impossible without the economic factors, the latter necessarily constitutes the state, whether or not there is coercion. We can easily imagine human life without brigandage and conquests, but we cannot imagine it without economic production.

We know that some countries have existed many years without invasions. But history does not cite a single fantastic and impossible example of a country that was able to exist a day without economic production and without exchange. Exchange invariably leads to political organization.

The weakness of Novicow's attempt to explain the origins of the state solely on the basis of its relation to exchange is apparent from the vague and indefinite concept of the state which he sets forth in this passage, and also from the fact that one could take his statement that exchange has existed for hundreds of centuries and make it the basis for a disconcerting query as to why the state did not come into existence until well within historic times.

4. The scope of state activity

Novicow's theory regarding the proper scope of state action is strikingly similar to that expressed by Herbert Spencer. He is an exponent of that type of uncompromising individualism which would limit the function of the state to that of performing the duties of a public police department. The sole legitimate function of the state is to maintain security and order, or, in other words, to protect the persons and property of its citizens.⁶² This theory of

⁶² *Les Luites*, pp. 335, 355, 494, 604. "L'État sera confiné dans une tâche unique: la protection des personnes et des biens, c'est-à-dire la justice." Ibid., p. 335. "La seule action de l'État qui soit vraiment utile, c'est la protection contre les violences. . . . L'État doit seulement protéger les personnes et les biens. Il doit empêcher l'assassinat et le vol." Ibid., p. 494.

the function of the state harmonizes with his sociological theory of justice in its more general sense as the survival of the best in society.⁶³ Not only is the action of the state beyond this function of protecting life and property futile, but it is also dangerous and operates to delay progress.⁶⁴ At the same time the performance of its proper function by the state is absolutely indispensable to the integrity of society.⁶⁵ The enforcement of contracts is the extent of legitimate state activity in the economic field. The state should not interfere in any way whatever in intellectual affairs, in religious matters, or in the relations between the sexes.⁶⁶

While Novicow is enough of a clear thinker to understand that liberty can exist only in connection with the presence of a political authority sufficiently powerful and active to protect the individual in his person and property through a system of legal rules and immunities, he does not believe that liberty can endure where the conception of absolute political sovereignty or extensive state-activity is realized in practice. To him liberty is, in essence, the abandonment on the part of the state of its irrational and expensive interference with those phases of human interests and activities which can best be settled by the free and unimpeded economic and intellectual competition of individuals. Novicow's defense of liberty and *laissez-faire* also involves a discussion of the relation of this attitude to the organic theory of society. Many writers, including Huxley and Ernest

⁶³ "Au fond, tous les législateurs des pays civilisés n'ont qu'un but: assurer la victoire des plus intelligents et éliminer les moins intelligents. Ce que nous appelons la justice n'est autre chose que l'application du principe de la survivance des plus aptes." Ibid., p. 484.

⁶⁴ "Toutes les fois que l'État assume une charge en dehors de son attribution véritable (la justice), il pratique le vol. Toutes les fois que l'État accomplit une fonction qui aurait pu être accomplie par les citoyens eux-mêmes, il fait rétrograder l'organisme social d'un degré dans l'échelle de la perfection." Ibid., pp. 353-354.

⁶⁵ "La fonction primordiale de l'État est la justice. Dès qu'il s'occupe des intérêts matériels et moraux, l'État ne *peut plus* pratiquer la justice. Or sans justice, une société tombe sans l'anarchie, donc dans la décomposition qui hâte sa mort." Ibid., p. 355.

⁶⁶ Ibid., pp. 206ff., 277ff., 334ff., 494. *L'Affranchissement de la femme*, passim.

Barker, have severely criticized Herbert Spencer for his alleged inconsistency in supporting both individualism and theory of the social organism. Novicow denies at length that there is any inconsistency in this and contends that the organic theory does not in any way imply paternalism or extensive state activity.⁶⁷

While Novicow is an extreme political individualist, he is an equally ardent exponent of the value of social coöperation and the extension of the principles of mutual aid and the division of labor. Few sociologists have exceeded him in the vigor with which he has urged the significance and the furthering of social solidarity.

Novicow's criticism of socialism is closely related to his analysis of nationalism and militarism. Our present capitalistic society rests upon the theory and practice of spoliation within and without a state. The socialistic remedy of expropriation is simply a proposal that proletarian spoliation shall supplant *bourgeois* exploitation. What is needed is a doctrine of "mutualism" which will discredit the spoliation theory and practice and do away with capitalistic oppression and its proletarian counterpart, socialism. This view Novicow develops particularly in his last work, *Mécanisme et limites de l'association humaine*. He thus takes a point of view in common with G. D. H. Cole, the leader of the gild-socialists, namely that Marxian socialism is the impracticable product of a diseased and oppressive economic and social order.

5. *The reconstruction of international relations*

The necessary readjustments in international relations and the scope of legitimate state activity in the field of foreign relations claim a large amount of Novicow's attention. Since it is the prime function of the state to insure the security of the persons and property of its citizens, and inasmuch as this obligation extends to the protection of the citizens against assault and spoliation at the hands of

⁶⁷ *Les Luites*, p. 473. *Annales de l'institut de sociologie*, Vol. IV, 1898, pp. 169-339; *Conscience et volonté sociale; Théorie organique des sociétés*.

members of other states, it is necessary that the state enter into the domain of international relations.⁶⁸ But it is futile to expect that this security can be brought about by wars. Wars never settle any question permanently and are themselves the chief source of danger to the citizen from foreign influences.⁶⁹ Even an equilibrium of powers is at best a temporary and treacherous expedient in making possible international security.⁷⁰ The only sane, effective, and reliable means of bringing about permanent international peace is through a European federation.⁷¹ Only through such a federation can the separate states be prevented from making war at will. The absolute sovereignty of each state in the matter of making war is the chief cause of international anarchy, and once this sovereignty is transferred to the central body of the federation of European states, this most active and persistent cause of war will be removed.⁷² The function of this federation, as pointed out above, will be confined to maintaining peace between the component states within the federation.⁷³ This federation is being prepared by the operation of social, psychological and economic forces. International scientific and industrial congresses, uniform systems of weights and measures, the improvement of international law, international congresses of European powers, and the growing economic interdependence of nations, have all tended to make Europe a unified civilization in everything except a legal recognition of the fact. All that is now needed is to develop enough constructive imagination to legalize the conditions which actually exist and perfect the administrative machinery of the new central governing body of the federation.⁷⁴

Once this European federation is formed, political conceptions and ideals will undergo a transformation. The ideal will no longer be to make the state coëxtensive with any particular nation, but will rather be to make the state

⁶⁸ *Les Luites*, pp. 473ff., 502ff.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 509-518, 685.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 674-675.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 592-634; *La Fédération de l'Europe*, pp. 14-16, 31-32.

⁷² *Les Luites*, pp. 534-535, 626.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 623; *La Fédération de l'Europe*, Book IV.

⁷⁴ *Les Luites*, pp. 590, 615ff., *La Fédération de l'Europe*, Book III, *passim*.

an administrative unit of the size desired by any particular people. The principle of secession and the sovereignty of the people when applied in determining the extent of the state will adjust this aspect of the problem. Peoples should be allowed to decide to which political group they will belong.⁷⁵ The right of secession must be freely accorded to all members of a political organization.⁷⁶ The Confederate States of America had an unquestionable legal right to secede from the Union.⁷⁷ When the right of secession is recognized, political groups will tend to become based upon the interests and loyalty of the citizens. To extend its boundaries a state will then be required to have a record for good government which surpasses that of its neighbors.⁷⁸ The unification of modern Italy was the first great historic example of the assertion of the popular right to fix the boundaries of a state.⁷⁹ Not only should the state allow political boundaries to be determined by the popular will; it should also allow unrestricted emigration and immigration.⁸⁰ The subdivision and decentralization of the modern national state will probably accompany international federation and such a step will then be safe for the first time. Administrative convenience and popular desire will be the dominating motive in political procedure rather than the ideal of national egoism and expansion.⁸¹

⁷⁵ *Politique internationale*, p. 354. "L'association politique devrait être basée sur le libre consentement des individus." *Les Luites*, p. 252. "Si l'on supprimait la force, les sociétés humaines se grouperaient aux mieux de leur intérêts, et les frontières des États s'adaptent aussi parfaitement que faire se peut aux besoins matériels et intellectuels de leurs citoyens." *Ibid.*, p. 254.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 255ff., 268.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 258.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 271ff.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 259f.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 387ff. "En résumé, les nations qui n'entraveront en aucune façon les mouvements spontanés des populations, celles qui renonceraient absolument à toutes les mesures coercitives, tant par rapport à l'immigration que par rapport à l'emigration, sont celles qui auront la croissance la plus rapide." *Ibid.*, p. 399.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 625ff. Novicow does not make it clear just how he can consistently support the doctrine of secession as applied to any particular state and not have the same theory apply with even greater force to his general federation of states. Probably he would declare for expediency rather than consistency.

To be sure, the establishment of an European federation will by no means immediately bring in an era of cosmopolitanism or perpetual and universal peace. Federation will, however, eliminate most of the opportunities for making war and will allow conflict to be turned into beneficial intellectual channels.⁸² In fact, it is the fundamental purpose of international federation and the resulting freedom from physical conflict, to allow a much greater development of that intellectual conflict between individuals, classes, and nations upon which progress depends.⁸³

In his *Mécanisme et limites de l'association humaine*, Novicow discusses the problem of internationalism from another angle. Economic factors produce the state and law tends to follow in the wake of exchange. Exchange is now becoming international, the national state is therefore breaking down and the way is being prepared for international federation. This will come in time without conscious human endeavor through the pressure of economic forces on politics and diplomacy. Yet, the realization of international federation is being obstructed and delayed through the utterly false notions which now prevail relative to the social and political value of war, conquest and spoliation. The origin and development of the state has been chiefly the process of ever extending the limits of the area within which spoliation has been found unprofitable and undesirable. This process will go on until federation has ruled out all conquest and spoliation. What is needed to hasten this development is a vigorous campaign of education which will demonstrate to the public and to statesmen that the doctrine of the social, economic and political value and contributions of spoliation is the most deadly illusion which has ever been invented by man. Once this is achieved, federation will immediately result and humanity will be spared the generations of war and misery which will elapse before this result would be produced by automatic evolution.

⁸² Ibid., pp. 425ff., 627f.

⁸³ Ibid., pp. 627ff. "Nous voilà donc arrivés à pouvoir formuler la base indestructible de la politique internationale. Son principe fondamental est que les sociétés doivent lutter les unes contre les autres par le procédé le plus parfait." *La Politique internationale*, p. 354. Cf. *La Critique du darwinisme social*, pp. 80-81.

6. *Extra-legal phases of political control*

In view of Novicow's lack of faith in the state as the directive organ in society, and as an important factor in social progress, one is not surprised to find that he lays great stress upon the non-political factors in society. There is nothing to be hoped for from the state outside of its police function. When it advances beyond this point it only brings stagnation, degeneration and confusion into society.⁸⁴ The organic sociologists who have referred to the government as the brain of the social organism have been guilty of a serious error. The government is only the motor nerves of the social organism; the *élite* are the true social brain.⁸⁵ It is the *élite* who shape public opinion and thus give moral tone to society. The state is an ineffective regulator of morality; public opinion is the only force which can regulate morality in an efficient manner.⁸⁶

Political parties are absolutely essential to a proper functioning of constitutional government, under a parliamentary system.⁸⁷ Under the leadership of the *élite*, political parties supply a most important mechanism for carrying on intellectual conflict in the field of political activities.⁸⁸

Novicow's important contributions to a better understanding of the biological, psychological and economic factors which exert so potent an influence on the origin, development and functioning of political institutions have been analyzed in connection with other topics and cannot be repeated in this place. They are in harmony with that tendency to broaden the approach to political theory and analysis which has characterized what Professor Dunning has happily designated the "societarian political theory."

While Novicow, along with Spencer and Sumner, is usually taken as an example of extreme individualism and the exponent of the opposite viewpoint from that of Lester F. Ward, L. T. Hobhouse and Ludwig Stein, yet his solution of

⁸⁴ *Les Luttes*, p. 354.

⁸⁵ *Conscience et volonté sociales*, p. 22-23.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 237-238; *Les Luttes*, pp. 309f.

⁸⁷ *Les Luttes*, p. 264.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 263ff.

social problems bears one resemblance to that of Ward, namely, the emphasis which he places on education. The one great influence and power which can solve our national and international problems is a system of education designed to discredit the current obsession as to the virtue and necessity of social, economic and national spoliation. This change of attitude on the part of society would well-nigh produce a social millenium. The great difference between Novicow and Ward on this point is that Ward believed education in social science to be an indispensable prerequisite to an intelligent statecraft, while Novicow believes that the proper type of education would remove most of the problems which now confront statesmen.

Novicow was fortunate enough to die in 1912; otherwise he would have been the legitimate leader of the "I told you so" chorus. Since 1914 it has been the popular procedure to hold up the internationalist leaders, such as Novicow and Norman Angell, to derision and scorn.⁸⁹ As a matter of fact, the World War and its aftermath have been the means of furnishing the most stupendous and tragic proof of the essential accuracy of their contentions as to the nature and results of militaristic psychology and the imperialistic diplomacy. The future holds in it little hope for the western world unless their doctrines are more effectively put into practical operation.

⁸⁹ See for example William Stearns Davis' grotesque sally in his *The Roots of the War*, pp. 468ff. For Norman Angell's demonstration of the manner in which recent history has vindicated his doctrines see his *The Fruits of Victory: A Sequel to the Great Illusion*.